

Environmental Review Report: Draft Alternatives

## **CITY OF BELLEVUE**

### **EASTGATE/I-90 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION PROJECT**

**Prepared for:  
City of Bellevue**

**September 1, 2011**





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>A. BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS .....</b>	<b>8</b>
1. EARTH .....	8
2. AIR.....	10
3. WATER .....	11
4. PLANTS .....	14
5. ANIMALS .....	16
6. ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES .....	16
7. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH.....	17
8. LAND AND SHORELINE USE.....	19
9. HOUSING.....	22
10. AESTHETICS.....	22
11. LIGHT AND GLARE .....	23
12. RECREATION.....	23
13. HISTORIC AND CULTURAL PRESERVATION .....	24
14. TRANSPORTATION .....	24
15. PUBLIC SERVICES.....	27
16. UTILITIES .....	27
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>29</b>
 <b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b>	
COMPARISON OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS .....	APPENDIX A



## ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW REPORT

### A. BACKGROUND

#### 1. Name of the proposed project:

Eastgate/I-90 Land Use and Transportation Project

#### 2. Name of Applicant:

City of Bellevue

#### 3. Address and telephone number of applicant and contact person:

Mike Bergstrom  
Planning & Community Development  
City of Bellevue  
P.O. Box 90012  
Bellevue, WA 98009-9012  
(425) 452-6866

#### 4. Date of Review:

Summer 2011

#### 5. Agency requesting checklist:

City of Bellevue

#### 6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):

Once a preferred alternative is identified and accepted by the City Council, that alternative would be implemented through amendments to the City's Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Code, Zoning Map, and other regulatory and policy documents. Those amendments are anticipated to occur in 2012. The planning Horizon for the plan is Year 2030.

#### 7. Plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal:

After evaluation of these alternatives, the City with CAC and public input will select or develop a preferred alternative. Following acceptance by the City Council, related amendments to City policy and regulatory documents will occur. Future development in the I-90 corridor would occur in a manner consistent with those amendments.

#### 8. Environmental information that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this project:

This document is an initial environmental review of the proposed Eastgate/I-90 Land Use and Transportation Project alternatives. It is a part of the *Evaluation of Draft Alternatives Report*, which considers multiple aspects of the alternatives. It draws in part from other environmental documents prepared for this project, including but not

limited to, the following: *Eastgate Preliminary Screening Analysis* (Perteet, December 2009); *Existing Conditions Inventory* (City of Bellevue, Summer 2010); and the Technical Memos appended to the *Evaluation of Draft Alternatives Report* (City of Bellevue, September 2011).

**9. Applications that are pending for governmental approvals or other proposals directly affecting the property covered by the proposal:**

There are no pending applications directly affecting development and implementation of a preferred alternative for the Eastgate/I-90 corridor.

**10. List of governmental approvals or permits that will be needed for the proposal:**

Implementation of a preferred alternative will ultimately require changes to the City's Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Code, Zoning Map, and other policy and regulatory documents. As the plan is implemented, individual projects will require project level review and approval.

**11. Brief, complete description of the proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site:**

**Project Overview**

The purpose of the City of Bellevue's Land Use & Transportation Project is to develop a long-range (to Year 2030) plan for the evolution of the Eastgate/I-90 corridor. The project will develop and evaluate alternative growth scenarios for the Eastgate/I-90 corridor to help ensure the area continues to attract and retain employers, provide a mix of services to surrounding neighborhoods, and serve as a vibrant and significant contributor to Bellevue's economic health in the coming decades. The project will ultimately result in a recommended Preferred Alternative for acceptance by the Bellevue City Council, which is expected to lead to revisions to the Bellevue Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Code, and other policy or regulatory documents in order for the accepted alternative to be implemented.

The primary geographic focus of this project is the commercial area fronting I-90, one of the city's major employment centers, containing approximately 17% of the city's total employment. However, the project recognizes that growth, and decisions about growth, within the study area can affect surrounding neighborhoods. Therefore, this qualitative environmental assessment considers potential impacts beyond the study area boundaries.

**SEPA/GMA Integration**

For the purpose of compliance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), this project is utilizing the "Integrated SEPA/GMA" process authorized by WAC 197-11-210. This integrated process ensures early consideration of environmental issues and helps inform the development of alternative courses of action. It also includes early and expanded "scoping" of environmental concerns to identify environmental issues that might influence decisions on future plans or courses of action. Since the project

inception, environmental considerations have informed the understanding of the study area and the development of alternatives, and input has been sought on environmental issues of concern to the public.

Because this type of environmental review occurs at the “programmatic” or “non-project” level, it is by definition less specific or quantifiable than what would occur at a “project” level. Depending on the nature of the Preferred Alternative ultimately proposed by the CAC and accepted by the City Council, more in-depth environmental review may be required at future stages. These stages include the adoption of amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Code, and other policy/documents to implement the Preferred Alternative, and any proposal to construct a project in accordance with the amended policy or regulatory documents.

For the purpose of the Eastgate/I-90 Land Use & Transportation Project, a qualitative assessment of environmental consequences arising from the No Action and the three Action alternatives was undertaken. This assessment is one of the several, but not the only, pieces of information the CAC and City Council will consider as they develop or adopt a Preferred Alternative.

### **Alternatives Being Evaluated**

As part of the project, the City of Bellevue developed one “no action” and three “action” land use and transportation alternatives. The “Action” alternatives have been informed by the known environmental characteristics and the stated environmental concerns by the public regarding the study area and surrounding neighborhoods.

The No Action alternative does not mean no changes will take place in the Eastgate/I-90 corridor; rather, it is a projection of what changes are likely to occur if no changes to the Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Code, Transportation Facilities Code, or other policy and regulatory documents are made. In contrast, the Action alternatives reflect future scenarios that could happen if changes to those policy and regulatory documents were made.

The table below shows the types and amounts of new development that could be expected within the study area by the year 2030 for the No Action alternative and each Action alternatives. A summary description of the No Action and each Action alternative developed as part of the planning process is presented below:

<b>Land Use Type:</b>	<b>No Action</b>	<b>Alternative 1</b>	<b>Alternative 2</b>	<b>Alternative 3</b>
Office (Sq Ft)	200,000	1,000,000	2,000,000	500,000
Retail (Sq Ft)	0	100,000	50,000	200,000
Industrial (Sq Ft)	86,000	-167,000	0	0
Institutional (Sq Ft)	280,000	350,000	420,000	280,000
Residential (Housing Units)	0	2,000	0	400
Hotel (Rooms)	0	200	300	100

**No Action Alternative** This alternative is intended to depict a reasonable projection of how the study area would continue to develop over the next 20 years if no changes to the Comprehensive

Plan or Zoning Map were made. It is used to help assess the difference in change that would result from any of the “Action” alternatives being developed for the Eastgate/I-90 Land Use & Transportation Project. “No Action” does not mean no changes would occur in the I-90 corridor; it simply means that any changes that occur happen in accordance with existing land use and transportation regulations and adopted policies. Therefore, the No Action scenario assumes some amount of growth in the study area over the next 20 years, though of a more limited nature than would occur under any of the “Action” alternatives.

**Alternative 1 (Jobs/Housing Mix)** This alternative encourages the integration of land uses that are supportive of transportation options, such as bicycling, walking, and riding the bus. It builds on the existing Park-and-Ride as a transit hub, the proposed Mountains to Sound Greenway (MTS Greenway) as a landscaped bicycling corridor, and Bellevue College (BC) as an impetus for a high activity center. Increasing residential density, providing services for local residents and office workers, and improving pedestrian and bicycling access are key to this alternative.

**Alternative 2 (Regional Employment Center)** This alternative focuses on having enough office space for more jobs. It provides places for additional jobs by accommodating office space consistent with regional growth projections and the market demand analysis completed in support of this project. It builds on the existing concentration of offices, the excellent regional access, the Bellevue College (BC), and a light industrial zone. It supplies secondary office opportunities to downtown and Bel-Red and differentiates itself by allowing light industrial uses proximate to offices. To remain competitive, services and amenities for office workers are essential to this scheme. As a center for innovation, partnerships are built between BC and neighboring research and development firms.

**Alternative 3 (Functional Improvements)** This alternative focuses on modest growth and change, transportation functionality, and neighborhood services. The role of the corridor remains the same as today, but improvements address known issues and overall needs of Bellevue. Retail and service uses that support nearby offices and the surrounding community would be strengthened and enhanced, additional office potential would be created, and new residential opportunities would be provided. Connections and streetscapes that link activity areas, neighborhoods, services, and transit would be improved.

### **Scoping Process**

Initial scoping for the Eastgate/I-90 land use and transportation project began in December 2009 when the City of Bellevue conducted a preliminary screening analysis of traffic operations through the study area in order to evaluate the viability of two



preliminary growth scenarios. The results of this analysis provided a good understanding of existing transportation conditions, identified existing points of congestion, and provided a solid foundation on which to base future development and land use alternatives. The Bellevue City Council approved the project scope and principles in early February 2010, including the concept of using the Integrated SEPA/GMA process.

The project scope, in part, was designed to address environmental considerations. In addition to being cognizant of natural environmental constraints, such as steep slopes, streams, and wetlands within and neighboring the study area, the project scope and principles were concerned with ensuring adequate utility, transportation, and social (parks, fire police, schools, etc) infrastructure to support any future land use and transportation scenario that might emerge from the planning process. Key among these considerations is the development of alternatives for transportation infrastructure based on an analysis that focused on modeling and evaluating preferred land use alternatives including providing regional access and promoting adequate circulation within the study area, while mitigating impacts to the surrounding landscape. Additionally, considerations for greenhouse gas emissions were studied in accordance with Washington State greenhouse gas reduction goals by exploring means to reduce GHG emissions within the project area. The selection of a preferred alternative will be based on, in part, an understanding of the GHG emission consequences of each draft alternative, and of the necessary transportation improvements needed to accommodate the project vision and providing strategies to minimize impacts to the surrounding area.

The project principles were developed with the intention of enhancing the economic viability of the Eastgate corridor while not degrading the mobility of other parts of the city, and to ensure that it continues to contribute to the diversity of the City's economic mix. In achieving this goal, planning would require the consideration of integrated land uses and transportation across Eastgate, with the consideration of transit-oriented developments in portions of the area. Changes in land use should be informed by transportation opportunities and impacts, such that facilities may create opportunities for a well integrated district promoting land use and transportation performance. The project principles are based on a model of environmental sustainability so that future plans for the area produce measurable environmental benefits.

### **Public Outreach**

In moving forward with the Eastgate/I-90 Land Use and Transportation Project, the City of Bellevue introduced and worked with the public to identify issues and concerns through a series of dialogues. This occurred through open houses, online surveys, stakeholder interviews, community association dialogues, and other interest group interactions. Public involvement with the project began in spring 2010 and has continued to the present. The first set of open houses was held in March 2010 and addressed the project objectives in addition to the SEPA and GMA methodology to be

used in the planning process. The public was encouraged to participate by helping to identify environmental issues to help in a more formal SEPA determination. To assist in project development the City prepared an Existing Conditions Inventory report in summer 2010. This inventory documented, among many things, several environmental features including existing land uses, elements of the physical environment (i.e. streams, wetlands, topography/steep slopes), parks and recreation, utility infrastructure, transportation infrastructure, and transit services.

A Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) was appointed by the City Council in October 2010 and quickly became familiar with the preliminary screening analysis, the project scope and principles, the existing conditions inventory, and public input. From this information the CAC drafted the alternatives that are currently under consideration. The draft alternatives were introduced for public feedback through two open houses held in June 2011. Several avenues for outreach have been used to gain public input for the SEPA process. In addition to open house forums, SEPA related comments have been provided from CAC meetings, online questionnaires, an online visual preference survey, stakeholder interviews, neighborhood association presentations, interest group/professional association presentations, and economic development forums. Public involvement has been critical in the environmental scoping and planning process.

Through the planning process and public involvement several environmentally-related topics were identified as important. Traffic and transportation infrastructure was the most prevalent concern identified through public feedback. Notable problems with transportation infrastructure include congestion, poor circulation, poor freeway access, and poor signal timing.

A concern identified by some residents living around the nearby Phantom Lake was the effect that further development in the northeast part of the study area might have on water quantity and quality in Phantom Lake, particularly if impervious surface area is increased as a result of any Action alternative. These residents expressed concerns that further development in the Phantom Lake drainage basin (a portion of which lies within the study area) may exacerbate existing or perceived water quality issues in Phantom Lake. In addition, several environmental concerns were identified by the public including, but not limited to, stream, wetlands, and steep slopes, particularly in the Richards Valley industrial area. People questioned how these natural features might be impacted or might influence future development. Other concerns expressed by the public included existing freeway noise, light and glare impacts from auto dealers on the north side of I-90, air quality, and aesthetics related to lack of freeway landscaping and the general appearance of the corridor.

A number of valuable environmental interests have been identified through the planning process in conjunction with the Citizens Advisory Committee and through public involvement. Among the environmental interests that have been identified as having a high level of interest include, but are not limited to, promoting environmentally sustainable development, providing a variety of transportation choices, mixing land uses

to provide services and amenities within walking distance of office buildings, exploring opportunities for improving environmental conditions in Richards Valley, landscaping of the freeway corridor, and using the Mountain-to-Sound Trail as a unifying visual element/basis for a “green theme”. In all, public involvement has played a significant role in identifying and directing goals for the development of the Eastgate/I-90 land use and transportation project.

**12. Location of the proposal, including street address, if any, and section, township, and range; legal description; site plan; vicinity map; and topographical map, if reasonably available:**

Refer to the project description above and the main body of the *Evaluation of Draft Alternatives Report* for project maps and geographic information.

**B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS****1. Earth****a. General description of the site:**

The Eastgate/I-90 study area is spread across three different subareas in the city: Richards Valley, Eastgate, and Factoria. The study area is currently developed and contains a mix of office, retail, industrial, institutional, and residential land uses. The study area displays topographic characteristics typical of the Puget Sound region, with prominent slopes and streams carving ravines to lower waters. There are a number of steep areas, mostly in areas of ravines or as a result of cuts made for I-90. The notable slopes are near Sunset ravine; along the southern edge of Bellevue College; south of I-90 along SE 36<sup>th</sup> Street; along the area just west of 150<sup>th</sup> Avenue; and along the northwest side of the landfill park site.

**b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?**

There are a number of steep slopes in the study area that exceed a 40 percent grade. The steepest slopes are located near Sunset ravine, along the southern edge of Bellevue College, south of I-90 along SE 36<sup>th</sup> Street, along the area just west of 150<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and along the northwest side of the landfill park site.

**c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? Specify the classification of agricultural soils and note any prime farmland.**

The Soil Surveys for the City of Bellevue indicate that the project site is primarily underlain by Snohomish Silt loam, a hydric soil that has been artificially drained. Soil maps for the study area are available to view on the City's website at:

[http://www.ci.bellevue.wa.us/pdf/Development%20Services/09a\\_nrcs\\_soils\\_Internet.pdf](http://www.ci.bellevue.wa.us/pdf/Development%20Services/09a_nrcs_soils_Internet.pdf)

**d. Are there any surface indications or a history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.**

The study area is not classified as a "seismic hazard area". No liquefaction susceptibility hazard areas are mapped within the study area. No landslide hazards are mapped within the study area. The study area is heavily developed. There are few natural surfaces. There are no known indications of unstable soils. Landslide and seismic hazard areas in the study are mapped and are available to view at the City's website at:

[http://www.bellevuewa.gov/pdf/Development%20Services/12a\\_seismic\\_Internet.pdf](http://www.bellevuewa.gov/pdf/Development%20Services/12a_seismic_Internet.pdf)

**e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate the source of the fill.**

The development and implementation of a preferred alternative is a non-project or programmatic action and would not directly result in any filling or grading. New development under any of the alternatives would likely result in some degree of filling and grading, the extent of which would be dependent on the amount of development proposed. In general Alternatives 1 and 2 would expect the most development, while Alternative 3 would expect less. The No-action Alternative would expect the least development. New development activities under any of the alternatives would be subject to further review on a case-by-case basis and would need to be consistent with the City of Bellevue Municipal Code 27.36 "Clearing and Grading" and State Regulations. Appendix A provides a comparison of the expected impacts.

**f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use?**

Under any of the alternatives being considered, the intensity of land use in the study area would increase in the Eastgate/I-90 study area. Potential impacts from erosion associated with clearing and development activities in the Eastgate/I-90 study area would occur with most new development and the addition of new infrastructure proposed under any of the alternatives. The scale of potential erosion depends on the amount of expected development. Refer to Appendix A for a comparison of the expected magnitude of development and resultant erosion under each of the alternatives.

**g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example buildings or asphalt)?**

The majority of the study area contains impervious surfaces (59 percent) including roads, parking lots, and commercial, industrial, residential and institutional buildings.

Under any of the alternatives, development or redevelopment in the study area would occur and could result in an overall increase in impervious area. Transportation improvements including but not limited to roadways, sidewalks, bicycle and pedestrian trails, and transit centers could also result in a net increase of impervious surface area.

However, because pervious areas currently include critical areas, buffers, parks and required screening, new development may replace currently impervious surfaces instead of creating significant amount of new impervious areas. The total amount of impervious area that would result from implementation of any of the alternatives is unknown, although the expected magnitude of development may be a proxy for the relative magnitude of new impervious area. A comparison of anticipated impervious surface under each alternative is presented in Appendix A.

**h. Describe the proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any.**

Soils temporarily exposed during construction could be eroded by stormwater. However, all construction projects would be required to comply with the City's erosion control regulations. Erosion control measures including but not limited to BMPs and appropriate site management techniques would be implemented to mitigate these potential impacts. Following construction, graded or filled areas would be stabilized and landscaped.

Minor erosion impacts are unavoidable. Assuming that development complies with the City's erosion control requirements, significant impacts from erosion are unlikely. The potential for erosion as a result of clearing and construction activities would not likely occur as a result of redevelopment activities. Construction activities would provide erosion control measures consistent with City of Bellevue Municipal Code and State Regulations on a case-by-case basis.

**2. Air**

**a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (e.g. dust, automobile, odors, industrial, wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities, if known.**

Development under any of the proposed alternatives would result in air quality impacts during construction activities including fugitive dust, odors, and emissions from heavy machinery, trucks, and other vehicles traveling to and operating on construction sites. Increased traffic congestion and delays due to construction would have the potential to increase localized emissions by slowing or stopping traffic.

Increased development under any of the alternatives would likely result in an increase in the number of auto trips and associated emissions. The relative size of the increase would depend on the amount and type of development expected under each alternative (refer to Appendix A for a comparison).

As part of the *Evaluation of Draft Alternatives Report*, a greenhouse gas emissions analysis was conducted (Fehr and Peers, 2011). The purpose was to evaluate the differences in Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions between the four alternatives. The results of the analysis show that because of the inclusion of residential development and multimodal transportation options, Alternative 1 is the only alternative that achieves lower per capita CO<sub>2</sub> emissions than the No Action Alternative. Alternatives 2 and 3 generate slightly higher levels of CO<sub>2</sub> per capita.

In general, however, the increase under any of the alternatives would not add an appreciable amount of emissions to existing conditions caused by surrounding urban development and I-90. It is unlikely that air impact would be significant.

- b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odors that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.**

Construction activities associated with development under any of the alternatives would have the potential to temporarily create odors and/or emissions. The King County transfer station has the potential to create odors, but the County is planning on redeveloping the transfer station, which would include additional odor control. There are no other known sources of off-site odors or emissions.

- c. Describe proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any.**

Mitigation measures to control air quality impacts would be considered and developed on a project-by-project basis, and could include transportation demand management strategies such as transit and carpooling incentives, bike facilities, and other means of encouraging alternatives to SOV travel.

### **3. Water**

- a. Surface:**

- 1. Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, and wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.**

Four streams, mainly tributaries or headwater segments, run through the central part of the study area and include, from east to west, Richards, Sunset, East, and Vasa Creeks. Four additional creeks cross the southern Lakemont extension.

Existing wetlands in the study area are located around Richards Creek just south of Eastgate Way and around headwater segments of East Creek just north of SE 30<sup>th</sup> Street. These wetland areas are linked to a larger wetland stream complex north of Kamber Road. Smaller wetland areas are on the site of the proposed Bellevue Airfield Park. A complete description of the areas surface waters is contained in the *Eastgate I-90 Land Use & Transportation Project Existing Conditions Inventory* (City of Bellevue, 2010).

- 2. Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.**

There are no known instances in which adoption of any of the alternatives would require work in the study area's streams or wetlands. Transportation improvements under any of the alternatives may include work on culverts. Development is likely within 200 feet of streams and wetlands where allowed.

Development under any of the alternatives would be required to comply with the City's critical areas code, which prohibits nearly all activities in streams and wetlands and their buffers. In cases where temporary impacts are unavoidable, the City's critical areas code requires mitigation that results in no loss of the functions and values of the resource.

Impacts to surface water resources and wetlands would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis. If future development is proposed in the vicinity of any surface waters or wetlands, the project action will be evaluated for consistency with the requirements codified in BCC 20.25H "Critical Areas Overlay District." The City would determine the appropriate mitigation of any potential adverse impacts.

**3. Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that could be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill materials.**

No filling or dredging activities in surface water resources or wetlands are planned as a component of any of the proposed alternatives. Future construction activities associated with development or redevelopment under any of the alternatives would not likely involve the filling or dredging of surface water resources or wetlands. The placement or removal of dredge or fill materials from surface waters or wetlands is not allowed by the City's critical areas regulations. Development would be required to remain outside of designated critical areas and buffers.

**4. Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversion? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities, if known.**

No surface water withdrawals or diversions are planned as a component of any of the alternatives. It is possible that transportation infrastructure improvements would affect culverts and may require temporary diversion. However, as a non-project plan, the specific nature of improvements is not currently known. Any diversion needed for culvert work would be temporary and would be assessed at a project specific level. All work would comply with the City's critical area code.

**5. Does the proposal lie within a 100-year flood plain? If so, note location on the site plan.**

New projects developing in accordance with the preferred alternative, once implemented, would not be located in the 100-year flood plain. Updated floodplain maps would very likely place some existing buildings in the floodplain. If these buildings were to redevelop they would have to meet city's regulations to elevate, flood proof, or otherwise reduce the risk of structural flooding. Construction projects occurring near or adjacent to streams would be subject to existing city regulations designed to protect critical areas including riparian corridors, floodplains, wetlands, and steep slopes.



**6. Does the proposal involve discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.**

No direct discharge of waste materials to surface waters is anticipated under any of the alternatives. Considerations for waste material discharge would be identified and evaluated on a case-by-case basis for proposed development within the study area. Waste material containment, storage, and disposal would be considered for projects with the potential to contaminate surface water bodies.

The probability for accidental spills is typically linked to the types of land uses included in each alternative. Appendix A includes a discussion of spill potential based on the land use mix included in each alternative.

**b. Ground**

**1. Will ground water be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.**

Under all of the alternatives, development is planned in portions of the study area that have been previously developed and are connected to stormwater facilities, municipal water facilities, and the sanitary sewer system. This infrastructure would eliminate the need for withdrawals from ground water and would help avoid/abate discharge to groundwater.

**2. Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any. Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) is expected to serve.**

Under all of the alternatives, no waste material would be discharged into ground water. There would be no septic systems or livestock in the study area. Considerations would be required on a case-by-case basis to ensure that individual construction activities and development sites take measures to abate and capture storm and waste water runoff, and properly store hazardous, toxic, or otherwise dangerous materials in a way to prevent potential impacts to ground water resources. If construction activities comply with the city's storm and wastewater regulations, clearing and grading standards, and all other building and development codes significant impacts to groundwater are unlikely.

**c. Water Runoff (including storm water)**

**1. Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (including quantities if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.**

Approximately 59 percent of the study is currently impervious. Storm water runoff in the study area is managed using a series of 26 stormwater drainage basins which

collect runoff and distributed it to one of ten different drainage basins. Water is then emptied into downstream water bodies. Several existing issues and constraints are recognized for the various drainage basins in the study area, and would warrant project-level consideration prior to new development.

Under the City's new stormwater regulations (adopted January 1, 2010) new or redeveloping sites are required to mitigate runoff to pre-developed/forested conditions. This means each parcel will be required to construct stormwater detention and treatment facilities and mitigate runoff rate and duration. Low impact development strategies and special water quality BMP's to reduce impacts to water quality would also be considered for new developments.

**2. Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.**

As noted above, all new development under any of the alternatives would be required to comply with current stormwater standards. If compliance is achieved a significant amount of waste material would not enter ground or surface water.

**d. Describe proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any.**

As of January 1, 2010 the City of Bellevue adopted new stormwater regulations intended to reduce the deleterious effects of imperviousness on stream health (water quality and quantity). The new regulations require that new development or redevelopment projects mitigate site runoff to pre-developed/forested conditions if downstream areas are less than 40% impervious. This is the case for the Eastgate/I-90 study area. This is a more stringent standard than existed when most of the area was developed.

Assuming that all new developments under any of the alternatives achieves consistency with the City's new stormwater standards, future developments would result in better stormwater management than exists currently. As such, the alternatives with greater expected development would likely achieve greater overall improvements to stormwater management. A more specific comparison of stormwater impacts and management under each alternative is presented in Appendix A.

**4. Plants**

**a. Types of vegetation found on-site:**

The study area is heavily developed and includes vegetation typical of developed areas in the Pacific Northwest. The area also includes areas of ornamental vegetation. A complete plant survey has not been conducted, but the following are species likely to be present.

- x Deciduous trees:** Alder, Cottonwood, Maple, other
- x Evergreen trees:** Douglas-fir, Hemlock, Cedar, Other

- x **Shrubs:** Sword fern, Salmon berry, Salal, Oregon grape
- x **Grass:** Various native, ornamental and invasive species
- **Pasture:** None
- x **Wet Soil Plants:** Cattail, buttercup, bulrush, skunk cabbage, other

**b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?**

The development and implementation of a preferred alternative would result in future construction activities and development or redevelopment of higher density infrastructure in the Eastgate/I-90 study area. The majority of the study area that would be impacted by new land uses has been previously cleared of vegetation. The amount of vegetation that will be removed or altered as a result of new development would vary depending on the magnitude of new development under each alternative. A comparison of the alternatives is included in Appendix A. Future projects occurring in the study area would be subject to review on a case-by-case basis and impacts to vegetation would be mitigated by following the city's critical area buffer standards and tree retention regulations.

**c. List threatened or endangered species or critical habitat known to be on or near the site.**

There are no known threatened, endangered, or critical vegetation species in the study area. As with the No-action Alteration, alteration or destruction of threatened, endangered, or critical vegetation species would be regulated by city, state, and federal rules. Significant impacts are not anticipated.

**d. Describe proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on-site.**

Adoption of any of the alternatives being evaluated would result in additional development and some loss of existing vegetation. All three of the action alternatives include provisions for landscaping of areas to improve the aesthetic and environmental character of the study area. Planting designs would incorporate the use of native species and would include low groundcover, low shrubs, and trees for canopy cover.

In addition, all development would be required to comply with the city's critical areas regulations, tree retention policies and setbacks and screening requirements. Mitigation and upgrades to parks and rights-of-way would recapture some of the lost vegetation. Development consistent with current regulations would not result in significant impacts.

Development activities that are not categorically exempt from SEPA would be subject to reviewed under the City's SEPA implementing ordinance (BCC 22.02). Any impacts to native vegetation as a result of future projects will be appropriately mitigated under SEPA substantive authority.

## 5. Animals

- a. Underline any birds and animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:**

Animals in the study area include species typically found in urbanized areas of the Pacific Northwest. Terrestrial species likely include various species of hawk, bald eagles, various songbirds, and various small mammals. Aquatic species likely include trout and various amphibians. Limited portion do the study area streams are fish passable and there are no salmon mapped in the study area streams.

- b. List any threatened or endangered species or critical habitat near the site.**

A review of WDFW Priority Habitats and Species (PHS) database indicates no PHS listed species are located within the study area. The study area does contain PHS listed habitat areas and wetland habitats, within the study area. Critical habitat areas (e.g., streams and wetlands) have been identified and mapped by the City. A discussion of threatened or endangered species or critical habitat for each alternative is provided in Appendix A.

- c. Is the site part of a migratory route? If so, explain.**

The study area is located within the Pacific Flyway, which is a flight corridor for migrating waterfowl and other avian fauna. The Pacific Flyway covers the entire Puget Sound region, and extends south from Alaska to Mexico and South America.

- d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any.**

The study area is highly developed and has not been identified as habitat for threatened or endangered habitat species. Sunset and Richards Creeks are identified as fish bearing, as are smaller segments of other streams. Project activities would avoid these streams, as well as wetlands and buffers. If development complies with the City's critical areas regulations, significant impacts to threatened or endangered species or their associated critical habitat areas would be unlikely.

## 6. Energy and Natural Resources

- a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.**

Energy use in the study area would be typical of urbanized commercial areas. Under any of the proposed alternatives, development or redevelopment would require electrical power for lighting as well as safety lighting around parking areas and walkways. Natural gas would be used within structures for heating and cooking. Construction under any of the alternatives would use gasoline and diesel.

- b. Would the project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, explain.**

The development and implementation of a preferred alternative would likely affect zoning and potential allow greater building heights. Increase shade could result, but would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis for consistency with city policies and standards.

- c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any.**

The development and implementation of a preferred alternative would encourage the implementation of green features into new building design.

Existing City and local utility infrastructure is adequate to serve the growth projected under any of the alternatives. Development and redevelopment in the study area would be consistent with all local utility standards. In addition, new development would consider and implement energy conservation into building design. Accordingly, no significant impacts to energy availability are anticipated.

## **7. Environmental Health**

- a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spills, or hazardous waste that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.**

The development and implementation of a preferred alternative would result in the construction of higher density infrastructure in the study area. Construction sites would pose a potential risks for fire and explosion, spill, or exposure to hazardous materials. Spills or leakage from heavy equipment at construction sites could occur, but would not be greater than what is normally anticipated during construction activities. Normal precautions would be taken in storing equipment, hazardous fuels, and other materials used in construction. Waste and storm water would be contained and treated appropriately to mitigate impacts to the environment. All construction activities would follow the city's storm and surface water code and clearing and grading code, in addition to all local and state regulations.

### **1. Describe special emergency services that might be required.**

Specific types of uses are not known at this stage of planning. While unlikely, it is possible that new uses could require special emergency services. These service needs would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. In general, it is not expected that special emergency services would be required for new development under any of the alternatives. Typical emergency services such as fire, police, and emergency medical response may be required for emergencies developing as a result of construction activities.

**2. Describe proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards.**

Normal precautions would be taken in storing equipment, hazardous fuels, and other materials used in construction. Storage, maintenance, and handling precautions for any materials considered to be hazardous materials would comply with International Fire Code requirements. Waste and storm water would be contained and treated in an environmentally safe manner. If development activities follow the City's storm and surface water code, grading and clearing code and other development and building codes, significant impacts from toxic chemicals, fire hazards, and/or wastes and spills are unlikely.

**b. Noise****1. What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment operation, other)?**

The project location has a long history of elevated noise levels associated with vehicular traffic originating from the I-90 freeway corridor. Noise from I-90 would have a variable affect on depending land uses at receiving sites. The potential impacts from noise are discussed for each alternative in Appendix A.

**2. What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)?**

Under any of the alternatives, short-term noise impacts could result from construction vehicles and equipment during daylight hours. According to Bellevue City Code, development activity and operation of heavy machinery would be limited to 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. on weekdays and 9 a.m. to 8 p.m. on Saturdays. No development activity or operation of heavy machinery would occur outside of these times, on Sundays or on holidays, except if permitted by the director of community development and only in cases where activity would not interfere with residential use permitted in the zone in which it is located.

Long-term impacts could result from increased traffic in the Eastgate/I-90 study area. However, the incremental increase in auto noise would be unlikely to significantly raise the overall noise level. Variations in noise generation between the alternative are discussed in Appendix A.

**3. Describe proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any.**

Significant noise impacts are not anticipated under any of the alternatives. Existing noise standards for construction and operation are likely sufficient to control potential noise impacts.

## 8. Land and Shoreline Use

### a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?

Office uses dominate the study area. Office clusters in the study area are on the northeastern edge, in the valley west of 161st Avenue SE, and fronting the freeway on the south. Office uses are also located south of Bellevue College in the Lincoln Corporate Center, west of Bellevue College in the Sunset North Corporate Campus, and as smaller components of light-industrial uses in the Richards Valley area.

Retail uses are in two main locations, Factoria Village near Factoria Boulevard and Eastgate Plaza near SE 37th Street and 150th Avenue SE. Other major retail uses include Toyota and Subaru auto dealerships around 150th Avenue SE, in the Sunset Village shopping area, and a Honda dealership along SE 36th Street.

Light industrial and warehouse uses are loosely clustered in Richards Valley, around SE 30th Street, in the general area between 139th Avenue SE on the east and Richards Road on the west.

The two major institutional uses are Bellevue College and the LDS church. A 59-acre parcel of the 99-acre campus of Bellevue College is in the study area. The campus is bounded by 148th Avenue SE to the east, SE 24th Street to the north, and Snoqualmie River Road to the west, while the 23-acre campus of the LDS church is bounded by 156th Avenue SE to the east, SE 28th Street to the north, and 148th Avenue SE to the west.

Public facilities classified as institutional/government uses are also scattered across Richards Valley, and these include the King County Transfer Station, PSE substation and the Humane Society.

There are a total of 221 residential units within the study area, all of which are multifamily units clustered between 142nd Avenue and Sunset Mini Park. In addition to these housing units, the study area has 655 hotel rooms in extended stay format hotels.

In terms of acreage, office uses are the largest consumers of land utilizing 40% of total acreage, while institutional uses consume 16%, commercial uses consume 13% and industrial uses consume 11% of total land area. A more detailed description of existing land use can found in the *Eastgate I-90 Land Use & Transportation Project Existing Conditions Inventory* (City of Bellevue, 2010).

### b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.

The site has not been used for agriculture in the recent past. The study area was logged in the early 1900s and was later developed for industrial and commercial land uses.

**c. Describe any structures on the site.**

The site has been intensely developed and contains a variety of land uses. Office uses dominate the study area, with office buildings clustered near the northeastern edge, in the valley west of 161<sup>st</sup> Avenue SE, and fronting the freeway to the south. Retail buildings are concentrated in two locations, Factoria Village and Eastgate Plaza. Light industrial and warehouses are loosely clustered in the Richards Valley. Two institutional complexes, Bellevue College and LDS church are located within the study area.

**d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?**

No structures would be demolished as a direct result of the development and implementation of a preferred alternative. Under any of the proposed alternatives, development and redevelopment is likely. Because the area is largely built out, redevelopment would result in demolition of structures. Appendix A provides a description of the anticipated land use changes under each of the alternatives and therefore the areas where demolition is likely.

**e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?**

The study area contains a number of zoning classifications. The predominant zoning in the study area is Office Limited Business, which allows for office, hotel, and limited retail use. Three clusters of Community Business zoning: The Factoria Village shopping center at the north end of the Factoria subarea, the Sunset Village on the north side of I-90, and Eastgate Plaza located to the southeast of 150<sup>th</sup>. The northeast section of the study area includes a large block of land zoned for Light Industrial. Bellevue College is in an area zoned Residential (R-5), although the college does not include residences. Residential zoning in the study area also includes multifamily areas (R-10) west of Bellevue College and two small multifamily parcels (R-20) south of 150<sup>th</sup> Avenue. In addition to these predominant zoning categories, several properties are zoned General Commercial, Neighborhood Business, or as Office.

**f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?**

The study area lies in several designations under the City's current compressive plan. These designations include community business, office limited business, public facility, and neighborhood business.

**g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?**

There are no shorelines of the state within the study area.



- h. Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area? If so, specify.**

Existing wetland are located around Richard Creek just south of Eastgate Way and around headwater segments of East Creek north of SE 30<sup>th</sup> Street. These wetland areas link to a larger wetland stream complex north of Kamber Road. Other small wetland areas are on the Bellevue Airfield Park site. In addition to wetlands, several streams are located through the study area. Richards, Sunset, East, and Vasa Creeks run through the central portion of the study area, while four additional streams are located near the Lakemont extension. A more detailed inventory of environmentally sensitive area can be found in the *Eastgate I-90 Land Use & Transportation Project Existing Conditions Inventory* (City of Bellevue, 2010).

- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?**

The Eastgate/I-90 study area currently supports 24,300 jobs. The number of jobs as well as the total population is expected to increase under any of the alternatives. The size of the increase is dependent on the amount and types of land uses included in each alternative. A comparison of expected land uses including office space and residential units is provided in Appendix A. In addition employment and population projections are included in other section of the *Evaluation of Draft Alternatives Report*.

- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?**

The adoption and implementation of any of the action alternatives would increase land uses intensity. However, the limited amount of residential development in the study area is not planned to be removed under any of the alternatives. Depending on the alternative, the amount of residential development is expected to increase or stay the same. Refer to Appendix A for a comparison.

- k. Describe proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any.**

Displacement impacts are not expected. No measures are proposed.

- l. Describe proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any.**

An examination of the Eastgate/I-90 corridor, resulting in the Eastgate/I-90 Land Use & Transportation Project, was called for in the City of Bellevue's Comprehensive Plan. The objective of the development and implementation of a preferred alternative is pursuant of the City's Comprehensive Plan Policy ED-19 which recognizes the need to "maintain and update integrated land use and transportation plans to guide the future of the City's major commercial areas and help them respond to change" and to further establish as a goal "to maintain the quality of older commercial areas, promoting redevelopment and

revitalization as needed to maintain their vitality”. As developed, the no-action alternative would be consistent with the City’s Comprehensive plan. The action alternatives, while consistent with the general policy direction in the Comprehensive Plan would necessitate specific changes to the City’s Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Code, and Zoning Map, and would include design elements to avoid land use incompatibilities.

## 9. Housing

- a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.**

The development and implementation of a preferred alternative could lead to the development of an additional 400 to 2000 housing units in the study area. The total number of residential units varies among the alternatives. Appendix A includes a comparison of each. Housing would generally be multi-family. Unit costs are unknown at this time.

- b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.**

No housing units would be eliminated by the proposed project.

- c. Describe proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any.**

Not applicable.

## 10. Aesthetics

- a. What is the tallest height of any of the proposed structure(s), not including antennas? What is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?**

Potential building heights under the action alternatives have not yet been determined, and will depend on how much additional development potential is ultimately proposed. Building materials, textures, and exterior coloring would be consistent with the aesthetics of the surrounding developments. A more specific comparison of aesthetics is addressed for each alternative in Appendix A.

- b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?**

See response to 10.a and Appendix A.

- c. Describe proposed measures to reduce aesthetic impacts, if any.**

Architectural design, building materials, color, texture, retention of existing trees, and landscaping with native and non-native trees and shrubs would be used to complement

the character of the site. Although design details have not been finalized, the architectural and landscape design would help with the renovation or adaptation of new developments into the Eastgate/I-90 study area.

## 11. Light and Glare

- a. What type of light and glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?**

Light and glare during daylight hours would likely come from glass windows associated with an increased building density in the study area. Sources of additional light and glare are dependent on the location and design of new uses. Sources of light during nighttime hours would come from electric lights associated with building lighting and exterior safety lights over walkway and parking lot infrastructure. A comparison of light and glare resulting from each alternative is included in Appendix A.

- b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?**

Light and glare from the project would be unlikely to constitute a safety hazard. Increased lighting from buildings, walkways, and parking areas could be viewed from adjacent properties. Landscaping and additional measures could be used to abate lighting that interferes with adjacent properties. Lighting for all development would comply with the city's lighting standards.

- c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?**

No existing sources of off-site light or glare would affect the proposed study area.

- d. Describe the proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any.**

Under any of the alternatives, the retention of trees and vegetation and landscape design would be implemented as necessary on a project-by-project basis to soften or filter light and glare generated from new development. Outdoor lighting would be designed to aim light where appropriate and avoid general light dispersion. Impacts from light and glare are not anticipated under any of the proposed alternatives.

## 12. Recreation

- a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?**

Depending on the eventual preferred alternative that is developed and implemented, it is expected to provide several designated and informal recreational opportunities. The addition of pedestrian and bicycle trails including the Mountain-to-Sound Trail would enhance access and aesthetic enjoyment through the study area. Landscaping and the

development of parks and trails would be incorporated into any of the action alternatives and would further enhance recreational options in the study area. Under any alternative, including the No Action, a new City park is proposed to be developed on the old Bellevue Airfield site in the northeast corner of the study area.

**b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.**

None of the alternatives would displace existing recreational uses.

**c. Describe proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreational opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant.**

The proposed alternatives would increase recreational opportunities in the vicinity by providing additional pathway and trail systems to increase mobility and aesthetic enjoyment of the Eastgate/I-90 study area. No additional measures are needed.

### **13. Historic and Cultural Preservation**

**a. Are there any places or objects listed on or eligible for national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.**

According to the National Register of Historic Places and the Washington Heritage Register, there are no listed places or objects on or adjacent to the Eastgate/I-90 study area.

**b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.**

No designated landmarks or evidence of historic, archeological, scientific, or cultural importance are located on or adjacent to the study area.

**c. Describe proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any.**

Because no historic or cultural resources have been identified, no specific measures are proposed. In the event that historic, cultural or archaeological resources were unexpectedly exposed during excavation or grading on a project site, all construction would be temporarily halted in the immediate vicinity of activity and the City of Bellevue and Washington Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (WOAHP) would be notified. Construction activity would not resume until the City, WOAHP, and a professional archeologist had been consulted.

### **14. Transportation**

- a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on-site plans, if any.**

The Eastgate/I-90 study area's transportation network is mapped in the *Eastgate I-90 Land Use & Transportation Project Existing Conditions Inventory* (City of Bellevue, 2010).

- b. Is the site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?**

Transit in the study area uses both local and commuter routes. Local transit service is provided by King County Metro and Sound Transit. Routes 221, 222, 240, 245, 271, 554, 921, 926 provide service from Eastgate to Downtown Seattle, the University District, Downtown Bellevue, South Bellevue, Issaquah, Medina, Mercer Island, Redmond, Kirkland, and other destinations.

In addition to local routes, numerous commuter orientated bus routes serve the Eastgate area. Most of these routes are designed to serve downtown Seattle via Eastgate en-route from Issaquah. Other routes include: Redmond to Renton and Kent, Issaquah to Northgate via Bellevue and University District, Eastgate to University District via Crossroads and Eastgate to First Hill via Mercer Island.

In addition, there are 'reverse peak' direction routes from downtown Seattle to Issaquah and from Northgate to Issaquah via Bellevue and Factoria. Communities south of Factoria are not provided with direct bus service but can access Eastgate by transfer at Factoria or the South Bellevue Park and Ride. These routes include 210, 211, 212, 214/217/218, 216, 225/229, 247, 272, 555, and 556.

Route maps as well as ridership information are provided in the *Eastgate I-90 Land Use & Transportation Project Existing Conditions Inventory* (City of Bellevue, 2010).

- c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?**

The number of parking spaces is not known at this phase of the planning process. The number of parking spaces will depend on the type and location of development. Development under any of the alternatives will be required to comply with the City's parking requirements and specific parking standards developed for the subarea.

- d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe.**

Yes, improvements to the study area's roadway network, transit system, and pedestrian accessibility are proposed under all of the action alternatives. A complete description of these proposed Improvements are included in the *Evaluation of Draft Alternatives Analysis*.

- e. **Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.**

No there are no water, rail or air transportation facilities in the study area

- f. **How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.**

Data from the Bellevue-Kirkland-Redmond (BKR) Travel Demand Model was analyzed to estimate the number of trips generated per square foot for each of the proposed alternatives. As shown, Alternatives 2 and 3 would generate approximately the same amount of trips that would occur under the No Action Alternative. Alternative 1 would generate slightly less. The results are summarized below where PM peak hour vehicle trip generation per thousand square feet (KSF) of development is shown for each alternative:

Development Scenario	BKR Model, Trips/KSF	BKR Model, Percent Reduction in Trips/KSF from No Action
2030 No Action	1.35	N/A
2030 Alternative 1	1.21	10.0%
2030 Alternative 2	1.35	0.1%
2030 Alternative 3	1.33	1.1%

Trip generation data was used to analyze traffic operations for each of the proposed land use alternatives. The quality of traffic operations on roadway facilities is described in terms of Level of Service (LOS), a measure of operational conditions and motorists perceptions. An LOS A represents the best operation and LOS F represents the worst. LOS was evaluated for twenty six intersections in the study area using PM peak on-hour traffic volumes.

In general, the data also show lower levels of service for all of the alternatives including the No Action scenario. There are little difference in resulting intersection levels of service or in entering intersection volumes among the No Action scenario and the three action alternatives.

The data show the greatest delay is experienced at the Factoria Blvd SE and SE 38th Place intersection; the only intersection expected to operate at LOS F in all of the alternatives in 2030 (including No Action). The following intersections experience LOS E conditions in all of the alternatives in 2030: 150th Ave SE & SE Eastgate Way; Factoria Blvd SE & SE 36th Street; 150th Ave SE & I-90 EB Off-Ramp; and, Lakemont Blvd & SE Newport Way.

The complete and detailed analysis of traffic and transportation in the study area is included in the *Evaluation of Draft Alternatives Report*.

**g. Describe proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any.**

All of the proposed action alternatives include transportation improvements that address congestion, transit, and pedestrian facilities. All of these improvements are being evaluated as measures to improve connectivity and access within the study area. These improvements are described in detail in the *Evaluation of Draft Alternatives Report*.

## **15. Public Services**

**a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally explain.**

The demand for public services is based on the population of people and density of uses in a given area. Because use intensity is expected to increase under any of the alternatives, the demand for public services is also expected to rise. The specific types and amounts of service demand depend on the types and amounts of land use. Appendix A provides a comparison of the alternatives.

In general, the existing service and utility infrastructure is adequate to serve the anticipated growth, and substantial upgrades are not expected to be needed. Therefore, significant impacts to public services are not anticipated.

**b. Describe proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services.**

Because it is assumed that existing service and utility infrastructure is adequate to serve the anticipated growth under any of the alternatives, no measures are proposed.

## **16. Utilities**

**a. Underline utilities currently available at the site:**

Electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic systems, telephone services and stormwater drainage are readily available in the study area.

**b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service, and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.**

Project-specific extensions of or upgrades to the utilities listed above are likely to be required as properties redevelop in accordance with the preferred alternative.

Available water utilities for fire flows in the study area generally fall within the typical range for commercial and multi-family development, which is 2500 to 3500 gpm. Fire

flows are generally adequate for all areas except the area zoned for office west of Richards Rd. This area's 1,500 gpm fire flow may not be enough for future development. However, none of the draft alternatives under consideration propose changes to land uses in that part of the study area. As properties throughout the study area redevelop, a detailed determination of flow adequacy would be made and would depend on the scale and nature of new development.

In general, however, the existing utility infrastructure is adequate to serve the anticipated growth, and substantial upgrades are not expected to be needed. Therefore, significant impacts to public services are not anticipated.



## REFERENCES

- City of Bellevue. 2010. Eastgate I-90 Land Use & Transportation Project Existing Conditions Inventory. Summer, 2010. Bellevue, WA.
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). 2011. Priority Habitats and Species (PHS) database. Accessed July 2011.
- Fehr and Peers. 2011. Eastgate Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis. Prepared for the City of Bellevue. August, 2011.

**APPENDIX A**

Eastgate/I-90 Land Use & Transportation Project: Summary of Potential Impacts

Associated Impacts	No Action	Alternative 1 Jobs/Housing Mix	Alternative 2 Regional Employment Center	Alternative 3 Functional Improvements
<b>Earth Impacts (erosion)</b>	<p>Clearing and development in the Eastgate/I-90 corridor under the No-action Alternative would occur with development and redevelopment under existing zoning in the next 20 years. Expected development includes new office and light industrial building, reconstruction of the King County transfer station and continued growth and development at Bellevue College.</p> <p>Soils temporarily exposed during construction could be eroded by stormwater. However, all construction projects would be required to comply with the City’s erosion control regulations. Erosion control measures including but not limited to BMPs and appropriate site management techniques would be implemented to mitigate potential impacts. Following construction, graded or filled areas would be stabilized and landscaped.</p> <p>Assuming that development complies with the City's erosion control requirements, significant impacts from erosion are unlikely.</p>	<p>Impacts from erosion associated with clearing and development activities in the Eastgate/I-90 project area would occur with the addition of new infrastructure proposed under Alternative 1; primarily associated with the development/redevelopment of office, retail, institutional, and residential infrastructure.</p> <p>Soils temporarily exposed during construction could be eroded by stormwater. However, all construction projects would be required to comply with the City’s erosion control regulations. Erosion control measures including but not limited to BMPs and appropriate site management techniques would be implemented to mitigate these potential impacts. Following construction, graded or filled areas would be stabilized and landscaped.</p> <p>Minor erosion impacts are unavoidable. Assuming that development complies with the City's erosion control requirements, significant impacts from erosion are unlikely.</p>	<p>Potential impacts would be similar to Alternative 1, except that more redevelopment could occur, thus slightly more erosion and sedimentation could occur. Assuming that development complies with the City's erosion control requirements, significant impacts from erosion are unlikely.</p>	<p>Potential impacts would be similar to Alternative 1 except that less redevelopment would be likely.</p>
<b>Earth Impacts (impervious surfaces)</b>	<p>A majority of the project area is currently impervious. This area contains roads, parking lots, and commercial, industrial, residential and institutional buildings. Pervious areas include critical areas, buffers, parks and screening.</p> <p>Development of additional office, industrial, and institutional buildings would likely occur in areas already covered by impervious surfaces. Expansion or widening of roadways, sidewalks, bicycle trails, and transit areas could result in additional impervious surfaces. However, because most of the buildable area is impervious, significant new impervious areas are unlikely.</p>	<p>The majority of the project area contains impervious surfaces including roads, parking lots, and commercial, industrial, residential and institutional buildings.</p> <p>Under Alternative 1, Development or redevelopment of the project area including new office, retail, industrial, institutional, and residential uses would occur in existing areas that are predominantly covered by impervious surfaces and would result in limited expansion of impervious surface under this alternative.</p> <p>Transportation improvements including but not limited to roadways, sidewalks, bicycle and pedestrian trails, and transit centers could result in an increase of impervious surface area. However, incorporation of green features and other pervious components would lessen the impact.</p> <p>While the total amount of impervious area that would result from implementation of this alternative is unknown, it is unlikely to significantly increase the current amount given critical areas, buffers, parks and screening requirements. As noted above, the potential increase in impervious surface under Alternative 1 is unlikely to result in significant impacts.</p>	<p>Potential impacts would be similar to Alt 1 except that more redevelopment would be likely, thus slightly more impervious surface could result. However, given the existing impervious condition of the study area, critical areas requirements and stormwater management requirements, significant impacts from erosion are unlikely.</p>	<p>Potential impacts would be similar to Alternative 1 except that less redevelopment would be likely.</p>

Associated Impacts	No Action	Alternative 1 Jobs/Housing Mix	Alternative 2 Regional Employment Center	Alternative 3 Functional Improvements
<b>Air Impacts (Emissions)</b>	<p>Temporary air quality impacts could occur during construction activities including fugitive dust, odors, and emissions from heavy machinery, trucks, and other vehicles traveling to and operating on construction sites. Increased traffic congestion and delays due to construction would have the potential to increase localized emissions by slowing or stopping traffic.</p> <p>Development occurring under this alternative would be required to comply with state and local air quality standards. Mitigation measures to control air quality impacts would be considered and developed on a project-by-project basis. If construction activities comply with local, state, and national air regulations impacts from emission are unlikely.</p> <p>According to the greenhouse gas emissions analysis, the total PM peak hour CO<sub>2</sub> vehicle emissions is estimated to be 129,900 lbs. This would be approximately 3.4 lbs. per capita.</p>	<p>Temporary air quality impacts would occur during construction activities including fugitive dust, odors, and emissions from heavy machinery, trucks, and other vehicles traveling to and operating on construction sites. Increased traffic congestion and delays due to construction would have the potential to increase localized emissions by slowing or stopping traffic.</p> <p>The increased development, particularly commercial and residential, under Alternative 1 would likely result in an increase in the number of auto car trips (see traffic analysis) and associated emissions. However, the increase would not add an appreciable amount of emissions to existing conditions caused by surrounding urban development and I-90. It is unlikely that air impact would be significant. Also, it is anticipated that closer amenities and increased non-auto trips would help to limit the overall increase in emissions in the area.</p> <p>According to the greenhouse gas emissions analysis, the total PM peak hour CO<sub>2</sub> vehicle emissions is estimated to be 142,800 lbs.; a ten percent increase over the No Action. However, this would be approximately 3.2 lbs. per capita representing a 6.2 percent decrease based on population.</p> <p>Mitigation measures to control air quality impacts would be considered and developed on a project-by-project basis, and could include transportation demand management strategies such as transit and carpooling incentives, bike facilities, and other means of encouraging alternatives to SOV travel.</p>	<p>Alternative 2 calls for twice as much commercial development as Alternative 1, but does not include additional residential or retail development. Temporary construction impacts would be similar to Alternative 1. In general impacts to air quality would be similar to Alternative 1 and are unlikely to be significant.</p> <p>According to the greenhouse gas emissions analysis, the total PM peak hour CO<sub>2</sub> vehicle emissions is estimated to be 154,500 lbs.; a 19 percent increase over the No Action. This would be approximately 3.5 lbs. per capita, representing a 3.2 percent increase over the No Action based on population.</p>	<p>Potential impacts would be similar to Alternative 1 except that less redevelopment would be likely. According to the greenhouse gas emissions analysis, the total PM peak hour CO<sub>2</sub> vehicle emissions is estimated to be 138,500 lbs.; a 6.6 percent increase over the No Action. This would be approximately 3.4 lbs. per capita, representing a 1.2 percent increase over the No Action based on population.</p>
<b>Surface Water Impacts (fill/dredge placed or removed from surface water or wetlands)</b>	<p>Surface water bodies including streams and wetlands are located in portions of the study area and are generally bounded by existing development. The placement or removal of dredge or fill materials from surface waters or wetlands is not allowed under the City critical areas code and would not likely occur as part of the No-action Alternative.</p> <p>Development would be required to remain outside of designated critical areas and buffers. Therefore, impacts to surface water bodies resulting from filling or dredging activities are unlikely.</p>	<p>Surface water bodies including streams and wetlands are located in portions of the study area, particularly in the northwest section, and are generally bounded by existing development. The placement or removal of dredge or fill materials from surface waters or wetlands is not allowed by the City’s critical areas regulations and would not occur as part of this alternative.</p> <p>Development would be required to remain outside of designated critical areas and buffers. Therefore, significant impacts to surface water bodies resulting from filling or dredging activities are unlikely.</p>	<p>As noted under the Alternative 1. Development under Alternative 2 would have to comply with the City’s critical areas code. Therefore, significant impacts to surface water bodies resulting from filling or dredging activities are unlikely.</p>	<p>As in Alternatives 1 and 2, compliance with the City’s critical areas regulations would prohibit disturbance of stream and wetlands in the study areas. Significant impacts are not anticipated.</p>

Associated Impacts	No Action	Alternative 1 Jobs/Housing Mix	Alternative 2 Regional Employment Center	Alternative 3 Functional Improvements
<b>Surface Water Impacts (withdrawals or diversion)</b>	<p>Surface water bodies including streams and wetlands are located in portions of the study area, particularly in the Richards Valley area and are generally bounded by existing development. Withdrawals or diversions from surface water sources are generally not allowed by the City’s critical areas code and would not occur as part of the No-action Alternative.</p> <p>Considerations for surface water withdrawals or diversions would be considered on a case-by-case basis for construction or redevelopment activities. Construction activities near or adjacent to surface water bodies would be required to comply with the City’s critical areas buffers and storm and surface water regulations. Significant impacts to surface waters from withdrawals or diversions are unlikely.</p>	<p>As noted under the No-action Alternative, surface water bodies including streams and wetlands are located in portions of the study area and are generally bounded by existing development. Withdrawals or diversion of surface water are generally not allowed by the City’s critical areas code.</p> <p>The amount of development expected under Alternative 1 is greater than that anticipated under the No-action Alternative. In the Richards Valley area there are areas planned for more intensive mixed-use and residential development. Accordingly, the potential for development proposals to affect surface waters is greater. However, construction activities near or adjacent to surface water bodies would be required to comply with the City’s critical areas buffers and storm and surface water regulations. Considerations of surface water withdrawals or diversions would be considered on a case-by-case basis along with mitigation for construction or redevelopment activities. Significant impacts to surface waters from withdrawals or diversions are unlikely.</p>	<p>The amount of development and/or redevelopment under Alternative 2 may be larger than under Alternative 1. With the Richards Valley area planned for upgraded industrial/technology uses and high-intensity office. The potential impacts to surface waters during construction may be marginally higher. However, as with Alternative 1, construction activities near or adjacent to surface water bodies would be required to comply with the City’s critical areas buffers and storm and surface water regulations. Significant impacts to surface waters from withdrawals or diversions are unlikely.</p>	<p>The level of development under Alternative 3 would be smaller than under Alternatives 2 and 3. And as stated for those alternatives, compliance with the City’s critical areas regulations would prohibit disturbance of stream and wetlands in the study areas. Significant impacts are not anticipated.</p>
<b>Surface Water Impacts (100-year floodplain)</b>	<p>Several tributary and headwater stream segments are located throughout the project area and are bounded by existing development. Construction activities located within the FEMA 100-year floodplain of streams located the project area would be required to comply with local, state, and federal floodplain regulations, in addition to the City’s critical area buffers.</p>	<p>Alternative 1 represents plans for greater development than under the No-action Alternative. However, similar to the No-action, construction activities occurring within the FEMA 100-year floodplain or critical area buffers of streams located in the study area would be required to comply with local, state, and federal floodplain regulations, in addition to the City’s critical area buffers. If construction activities occur in previously developed areas, significant impacts to floodplains are unlikely.</p>	<p>Alternative 2 could include more development or redevelopment than Alternative 1. However, similar to Alternative 1, all proposed project would be required to comply with local, state, and federal floodplain regulations, and the City’s critical area regulations. If construction activities occur in previously developed areas, significant impacts to floodplains are unlikely.</p>	<p>Potential impacts would be similar to Alternative 1 except that less redevelopment would be likely.</p>
<b>Surface Water Impacts (waste material discharge to surface waters)</b>	<p>Considerations for waste material discharge would be identified and evaluated on a case-by-case basis for proposed development within the project area. Waste material containment, storage, and disposal would be considered for projects with the potential to contaminate surface water bodies.</p> <p>The No-action Alternative would have the highest amount of industrial uses, which are more likely to handle hazardous materials. However, all development would be required to comply with the City’s stormwater code, in addition to local, state, and federal waste material discharge standards. The potential for accidental spill is present, but compliance with current regulations would likely result in no significant impacts.</p>	<p>As with the No-action Alternative, considerations for waste material discharge should be identified and evaluated on a case-by-case basis for construction activities occurring within the project area. Waste material containment, storage, and disposal would be considered for projects with the potential to containment surface water bodies.</p> <p>This Alternative includes a decrease in industrial uses and an increase in commercial and residential uses. These uses generally, do not use hazardous materials. The likelihood of potential spill would be less. Any development would have to comply with the City’s stormwater code, in addition to local, state, and federal waste material discharge standards, significant impacts from waste materials are not likely to occur.</p>	<p>The potential for impacts from waste material discharged into surface waters would be similar to that described under Alternative 1. Significant t impacts are unlikely.</p>	<p>Potential impacts would be similar to Alternative 1 except that less redevelopment would be likely.</p>

Associated Impacts	No Action	Alternative 1 Jobs/Housing Mix	Alternative 2 Regional Employment Center	Alternative 3 Functional Improvements
<b>Ground Water Impacts (withdrawals or discharge to groundwater)</b>	<p>Development activities are located in portions of the Eastgate/I-90 area that have been previously developed and are connected to stormwater facilities, municipal water facilities, and the sanitary sewer system. This infrastructure would eliminate the need for withdrawals from ground water and would help avoid/abate discharge to groundwater.</p> <p>No water would be withdrawn from or discharged into the ground water during project activities. Construction activities would not adversely affect ground water under the No-action Alternative plan.</p>	<p>As with the No-action Alternative, development activities are located in portions of the Eastgate/I-90 area that have been previously developed and are connected to stormwater facilities, municipal water facilities, and the sanitary sewer system.</p> <p>Under Alternative 1, no water would be withdrawn from or discharged into the ground water during construction activities. Considerations would be required on a case-by-case basis to ensure that individual construction sites take measures to abate and capture storm and waste water runoff, and properly store hazardous, toxic, or otherwise dangerous materials in a way to prevent potential impacts to ground water sources. If construction activities follow the City’s storm and wastewater regulations and clearing and grading standards, significant impacts to groundwater are unlikely.</p>	<p>Potential impacts under Alternative 2 would be similar to Alternative 1. There may be more development, but all construction would comply with relevant regulations. Significant impacts would not be expected.</p>	<p>Potential impacts would be similar to Alternative 1 except that less redevelopment would be likely.</p>
<b>Water Impacts (ground and surface water impacts from clearing and grading)</b>	<p>The majority of the project area contains impervious surfaces including roads, parking lots, or buildings. Additional long-term runoff would not result from construction associated with the No-action Alternative.</p> <p>Sources of short-term runoff would be associated with construction activities. To reduce potential sources of runoff, projects would follow all of the City’s applicable clearing and grading regulations and surface water engineering standards, including the placement and monitoring of BMPs devices. If development activities comply with the City’s storm and surface water and clearing and grading codes, significant impacts from runoff are unlikely under the No-action Alternative.</p>	<p>As with the No-action Alternative, the majority of the project area contains impervious surfaces including roads, parking lots, or buildings. Construction activities associated with new or redevelopment of office, retail, institutional, and residential land uses in the project area would have the potential to increase runoff.</p> <p>Potential sources of short-term runoff would be associated with construction activities. To reduce potential sources of runoff, projects would follow all of the City’s applicable clearing and grading code and surface water engineering standards.</p>	<p>Potential impacts under Alternative 2 would be similar to Alternative 1. There may be more development under Alternative 2, but all construction would comply with relevant regulations. Significant impacts would not be expected.</p>	<p>Potential impacts would be similar to Alternative 1 except that less redevelopment would be likely.</p>
<b>Water Impacts (ground and surface water impacts resulting from impervious surfaces)</b>	<p>The Eastgate/I-90 study area contains approximately 59% impervious area. Impervious surface is often used as a proxy for watershed condition. Watershed conditions begin to deteriorate once the basin is 10-15% impervious area (City of Bellevue Inventory Report, 2010). As noted, impervious area is well over 10-15%, indicating the study area’s hydrology is likely degraded compared to pre development/forested conditions. Total impervious area is not likely to decrease and may increase. Therefore, the increase from 59% may not be as important as how runoff from developed sites and roadways is managed.</p> <p>As of January 1, 2010 the City of Bellevue adopted new stormwater regulations intended to reduce the deleterious effects of imperviousness on stream health (water quality and quantity). The new regulations require that new development or redevelopment</p>	<p>Alternative 1 would encourage new development of office, retail, institutional, and residential uses within the study area, and redevelopment of areas that are currently zoned and used for light industrial uses.</p> <p>Under Alternative 1, mixed-use developments would be located west and southwest of Bellevue College, along the I-90 corridor to the southeast, and in the northeast, with Bellevue College acting as a mixed-use hub between development areas. Development of mixed-use areas under this alternative may require the rezoning of light industrial areas to residential, commercial, or community business. Light industrial allows for up to 85% impervious surface as does commercial or community business zoning, while medium-intensity residential allows for 80%. As such, rezoning light industrial areas to residential may result in a small decrease in impervious surface area after</p>	<p>Alternative 2 would encourage office, retail, and institutional development in the study area, while allowing existing industrial areas to remain, with an emphasis on additional office development.</p> <p>Under Alternative 2, new office developments would be positioned along the I-90 corridor, extending east to west. High intensity office space located in the east would be primarily developed in areas already zoned for office or office light business, or in areas currently containing parking lots. Office and office light business zoning allow up to 80% impervious surface. As such there would be no increase in the allowable impervious surfaces in these areas. However, because more redevelopment is likely, there could be more of an increase, simply because more parcels would be built out to the full extent allowed.</p>	<p>Alternative 3 would promote modest growth and change in the project area while increasing transportation functionality and neighborhood services. Retail services under this alternative would be enhanced, while new office complexes would be encouraged.</p> <p>Under Alternative 3, new medium intensity office complexes would be developed in the Richards Valley in the west in an area currently zoned for and containing light industrial uses, while additional office redevelopment would occur in the east. Additionally, new retail and services would be redeveloped adjacent to the I-90 interchange, while two mixed-use areas would be positioned in the study area, one located south of the Bellevue College campus and another located along the I-90 corridor in the southwest corner of the study area.</p>

Associated Impacts	No Action	Alternative 1 Jobs/Housing Mix	Alternative 2 Regional Employment Center	Alternative 3 Functional Improvements
	<p>projects mitigate site runoff to pre-developed/forested conditions if downstream areas are less than 40% impervious. This is the case for the Eastgate/I-90 study area.</p> <p>There are small-scale detention facilities owned by private property owners, the City, or King County scattered throughout the study area. However, the study area was largely developed under older stormwater regulations that, in many cases, did not fully protect downstream receiving waters. As a result, stormwater runoff is currently subjected to a lower standard of control (i.e., detention and treatment) than what is currently required.</p> <p>The study area currently contains areas zoned for office, commercial, light industrial, and residential uses (including R-5, R-10, and R-20). The current code (BMC 20.20.010) prescribes maximum percentages of impervious allowed on a project site in each zoning district (office, office light business, and neighborhood business: 80%; community business, light industrial, and general commercial: 85%; residential R-5: 55%, R-10: 80%, and R-20: 80%). Because many sites are not developed to the full extent allowed under the code, new development could increase the total impervious area in the study area.</p> <p>Likely new development would include new light industrial uses on the King County site, Bellevue College expansion and expansion of auto dealers north of I-90, as well as I-90 off ramp improvements, and minor development south of I-90. All of these would likely include new impervious area. However, new developments in the study area would be subject to the City’s current and more stringent stormwater regulations; mitigating runoff to mimic predevelopment/forested conditions. Assuming existing stormwater management on the properties being redeveloped is not as effective as new requirements and that new development complies with current requirements as outlined, each new development would represent an incremental improvement to overall stormwater management in the basin and study area.</p>	<p>redevelopment.</p> <p>However, assuming that the study area eventually develops to the full extent allowed, overall impervious area would likely increase above the current 59%. New developments would be required to meet current stormwater management standards and mitigate runoff to pre-developed/forested conditions. To this extent, any new development or redevelopment would improve stormwater detention and water quality. Because Alternative 1 would encourage more redevelopment than under the No Action Alternative, more of the study area’s stormwater management would be brought up to current standards and benefits to surface water management would be proportionally greater.</p>	<p>Proposed office developments in the central and western portions of the project area would occupy sites currently zoned for light industrial, community business, or office uses. Under current development regulations, light industrial and community business allow for up to 85% of a parcels surface area to be impervious, while office only allows for 80%. Rezoning these areas to office could result in a small decrease in impervious surface areas as compared to the No Action Alternative.</p> <p>Two mixed-use retail and service areas would be developed as part of this alternative, and would be located south of the I-90 corridor to the east and west respectively. These areas are currently zoned as general commercial and community business and would not likely require rezoning.</p> <p>Under this alternative light industrial uses would potentially be redeveloped in the northwest (Richards Valley) portion of the study area. While light industry would expand in this area, critical area buffers for streams and wetlands would limit the expansion of impervious surfaces.</p> <p>Similar to Alternative 1, because Alternative 2 would encourage redevelopment, more redevelopment is likely to occur than under the No Action Alternative, and the benefits to surface water management would be proportionally greater. The degree of redevelopment would be grossly similar to Alternative 1.</p>	<p>New office complexes would be encouraged in areas that are currently zoned for and contain light industrial uses. The City allows light industrial uses to develop up to 85% of a parcel with impervious surfaces, while office zoning only allows 80% of a parcel to be impervious. As such, rezoning light industrial areas to office may result in a small decrease in impervious surface area after redevelopment.</p> <p>New or remodeled retail located adjacent to the I-90 interchange would be developed in areas already zoned for commercial. As such it can be assumed that rezoning would not be required, and only minor increases in impervious surface coverage would be expected.</p> <p>Proposed mixed-use areas under Alternative 3 would occupy areas that are currently zoned for office, office limited business, or general commercial. Changes to zoning as a result of mixed-use development would not be likely as part of this alternative.</p> <p>Similar to Alternative 1, because Alternative 3 would encourage redevelopment, more redevelopment is likely to occur than under the No Action Alternative, and the benefits to surface water management would be proportionally greater. The overall amount of redevelopment would likely be less than Alternative 1 or 2.</p>



Associated Impacts	No Action	Alternative 1 Jobs/Housing Mix	Alternative 2 Regional Employment Center	Alternative 3 Functional Improvements
<b>Vegetation Impacts (removal or alteration)</b>	<p>The majority of the landscape in the study area where redevelopment is expected has already been cleared of vegetation and covered with impervious surfaces. Projects associated with the No-action Alternative would not result in the removal or alteration of existing vegetation.</p> <p>Restoration plantings and the development of park infrastructure is likely to occur. If development complies with the City's critical area buffers for streams and wetlands, impacts to vegetation are unlikely.</p>	<p>The majority of the landscape in the study area where redevelopment is expected under Alternative 1 has already been covered with impervious surfaces. As part of project development, green features such as utilizing natural drainage patterns and restoring fragmented or altered habitat could be implemented under this alternative.</p> <p>Restoration plantings, landscaping, and the development of park infrastructure are would occur under this alternative. If development complies with the City's critical area buffers for streams and wetlands, significant impacts to vegetation are unlikely.</p>	Potential impacts would not differ from Alt 1	Potential impacts would not differ from Alt 1
<b>Vegetation Impacts (critical/threatened/endangered species)</b>	There are no known threatened, endangered, or critical vegetation species in the study area. All development would comply with city, state, and federal rules related to critical, threatened, o endangered species. Significant impacts are not anticipated.	There are no known threatened, endangered, or critical vegetation species in the study area. As with the No-action Alteration, alteration or destruction of threatened, endangered, or critical vegetation species would be regulated by city, state, and federal rules. Significant impacts are not anticipated.	Potential impacts would not differ from Alt 1	Potential impacts would not differ from Alt 1
<b>Vegetation Impacts (removal)</b>	Impacts to existing vegetation are likely to occur under the No-action Alternative. However, all development would be required comply with the city's critical areas regulations, tree retention policies and setbacks and screening requirements. Therefore, significant impacts are not anticipated.	Much of the study area is currently paved or developed with buildings. Increased development is anticipated under Alternative 1. As a result some existing vegetation is likely to be removed. However, all development would be required to comply with the city's critical areas regulations, tree retention policies and setbacks and screening requirements. Mitigation and upgrades to parks and rights-of-way would recapture some of the lost vegetation. Development consistent with current regulations would not result in significant impacts.	Potential impacts under Alternative 2 would be similar to Alternative 1. There may be more development, but all construction would comply with relevant regulations. Significant impacts would not be expected.	Potential impacts would be similar to Alternative 1 except that less redevelopment would be likely.
<b>Animal Impacts (threatened or endangered species and critical habitat areas)</b>	The project area is highly developed and has not been identified as habitat for threatened or endangered habitat species. Sunset and Richards Creeks are identified as fish bearing, as are smaller segments of other streams. Project activities would avoid these streams, as well as wetlands and buffers. If development complies with the City's critical areas regulations, significant impacts to threatened or endangered species or their associated critical habitat areas would be unlikely.	Alternative 1 would include a larger amount of development than the No-action Alternative. However, the study area is highly developed and has not been identified as habitat for threatened or endangered habitat species. Because all projects development under this Alternative would comply with the City's critical areas regulations, existing area species and habitats would be protected. Significant impacts to threatened or endangered species or their associated critical habitat areas would be unlikely.	Alternative 2 could include a greater level of development than Alternative 1. However, all development would be required to comply with the City's critical areas regulations, which would largely protect existing area species habitat. Therefore, significant impacts would not be anticipated.	Potential impacts would be similar to Alternative 1 except that less redevelopment would be likely.



Associated Impacts	No Action	Alternative 1 Jobs/Housing Mix	Alternative 2 Regional Employment Center	Alternative 3 Functional Improvements
<b>Animal Impacts (migratory routes)</b>	<p>The study area proposed project is within the Pacific Flyway, an avian migratory corridor consisting of western coastal areas of South, Central, and North America. Development in the study area would not cross any known foraging grounds for migratory fowl.</p> <p>Most of the existing habitat within the project area has been fragmented. Construction activities under the No-action Alternative would not focus on additional land clearings or removal of existing habitat. If development activities comply with the City's critical areas regulations, significant impacts to migratory routes would be unlikely.</p>	<p>The proposed project would be within the Pacific Flyway, an avian migratory corridor consisting of western coastal areas of South, Central, and North America. Development in the study area would not cross any known foraging grounds for migratory fowl.</p> <p>Most of the existing habitat within the project area has been fragmented and is not conducive for migratory avian. Construction activities under this alternative would not focus on additional land clearings or removal of existing habitat, however denser land use concentrations will result from construction activities. If construction activities follow the City's critical area code, additional impacts to migratory routes are unlikely.</p>	Potential impacts would not differ from Alt 1	Potential impacts would not differ from Alt 1
<b>Energy Impacts (energy conservation)</b>	Development and redevelopment in the study area would be consistent with all local utility standards. In addition, new development would consider and implement energy conservation into building design. Accordingly, no impacts to energy are anticipated.	Existing City and local utility infrastructure is adequate to serve the growth projected under Alternative 1. Development and redevelopment in the study area would be consistent with all local utility standards. In addition, new development would consider and implement energy conservation into building design. Accordingly, no significant impacts to energy availability are anticipated.	Although Alternative 2 could include a greater level of development, existing City and local infrastructure is adequate to serve the growth projected in this alternative. Therefore, significant impacts to energy availability are not anticipated.	Potential impacts would be similar to Alternative 1 except that less redevelopment would be likely.
<b>Environmental Health Impacts (toxic chemicals, fire hazards, waste, and spills)</b>	Some risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste would result from normal development and construction activities under the No-action Alternative impact scenario. Some risks of spill/leakage from equipment would exist during construction or redevelopment of existing infrastructure. Risks would not be any greater than what is normally associated with construction activities. Normal precautions would be taken in storing equipment, hazardous fuels, and other materials used in construction.	<p>Some risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste would result from construction activities. Development would include some risk of spill/leakage from equipment during construction, but would not be greater under Alternative 1 than what is normally associated with construction activities.</p> <p>Normal precautions would be taken in storing equipment, hazardous fuels, and other materials used in construction. Waste and storm water would be contained and treated in an environmentally safe manner. If development activities follow the City's storm and surface water code and grading and clearing code, significant impacts from toxic chemicals, fire hazards, and/or wastes and spills are unlikely.</p>	Potential impacts would not differ from Alt 1	Potential impacts would not differ from Alt 1
<b>Noise Impacts (short and long term noise levels)</b>	<p>The project area has a long history of elevated noise levels associated with traffic from the I-90 freeway corridor. Additional development would increase the noise generated by auto trips. However, the incremental change in auto related noise would not be a significant additional to existing I-90 noise levels.</p> <p>Normal development activities would generate short-term, temporary noise impacts caused primarily by equipment operation. While the impact would be temporary, noise from construction activities would be noticeable, primarily in residential areas. However,</p>	<p>As noted under the No-Action Alternative, the project area has a long history of elevated noise levels associated with traffic from the I-90 freeway corridor.</p> <p>Alternative 1 would allow increased development that would result in more car trips and greater associated noise. However, the incremental increase in auto noise would be unlikely to significantly raise the overall noise level.</p> <p>Alternative 1 would introduce a substantial residential population in to the study area. This population would</p>	Alternative 2 could result in greater overall development that Alternative 1, but it does not include a residential component. Impacts from noise would likely be either similar or less than under Alternative 1.	Potential impacts would be similar to Alternative 1 except that less residential development and overall redevelopment would be likely.

Associated Impacts	No Action	Alternative 1 Jobs/Housing Mix	Alternative 2 Regional Employment Center	Alternative 3 Functional Improvements
	construction would be required to comply with all noise regulations.	<p>represent a new and potentially sensitive receptor to area noise. Residential buildings would have to sited and designed with noise control in mind. Assuming this was done, impacts from noise could be maintained below a significant level.</p> <p>Construction activities would generate short-term, temporary noise impacts caused primarily by equipment operation associated with development of the study area. While these impacts would be temporary, noise from construction activities would be noticeable, primarily in residential areas. Alternative 1 would have more construction associated with it than the No-action Alternative and therefore, greater potential for construction noise. However, construction would be required to comply with all noise regulations.</p>		
Land Use	<p>Bellevue Comprehensive Plan Policy ED-19 recognizes the need to “maintain and update integrated land use and transportation plans to guide the future of the City’s major commercial areas and help them respond to change” and to further “maintain the quality of older commercial areas, promoting redevelopment and revitalization as needed to maintain vitality”. Development/redevelopment practices aimed at land use are being evaluated for the study area, specifically for the Richards Valley, Eastgate, and Factoria subareas.</p> <p>The No-action Alternative would be consistent with the City’s current comprehensive plan and would include the expansion of office, industrial, and institutional land uses in the study area through the year 2030. The No-action Alternative would not result in an appreciable change in the existing character of the Eastgate/I-90 corridor nor would significant future changes be foreseeable under this plan.</p> <p>Projected growth under the No Action Alternative includes 200,000 sq ft of office, 86,000 sq ft of industrial, and 280,000 sq ft of institutional use. No new retail, residential, or hotel use is projected.</p>	<p>The policy basis for Alternative 1 is the same as for the No-action.</p> <p>Land use development under this alternative would encourage the integration of alternative transportation options (e.g., bicycling, walking, and transit) and would result in increased office, retail, institutional, and residential growth. Under this option the Eastgate/I-90 corridor would become a gateway for the community allowing residents to work, shop, and recreate in the community in which they live. This plan would encourage a re-investment in infrastructure through the study area. Implementation of Alternative 1 would necessitate changes to the City’s Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Code, and Zoning Map, and would include design elements to avoid land use incompatibilities.</p> <p>Projected growth under Alternative 1 includes 1,000,000 sq ft of office, 100,000 sq ft of retail, and 350,000 sq ft of institutional use. In addition, industrial use would be reduced by 167,000 sq ft. 2,000 new residential units and 200 new hotel rooms are projected. Alternative 1 reflects the greatest amount of residential growth of the three Action alternatives.</p>	<p>The policy basis for Alternative 2 is the same as for the No-action.</p> <p>Land use development under this alternative would focus on the development of infrastructure to encourage the creation of more jobs and regional growth. Alternative 2 would result in increased office, retail, and institutional growth. Under this alternative the Eastgate/I-90 corridor would become an integrated campus with the sense that it is a center for innovation. This plan would encourage growth and re-investment in infrastructure through the study area. As with Alternative 1, Alternative 2 would require changes to the City’s Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Code, and Zoning Map, and would include design elements to avoid land use incompatibilities.</p> <p>Projected growth under Alternative 2 includes 2,000,000 square feet of office, 50,000 sq ft of retail, and 420,000 sq ft of institutional use, and 300 new hotel rooms. No growth in industrial or residential use is projected. Alternative 2 reflects the greatest amount of office, institutional, and hotel growth of the three Action alternatives, but the least amount of residential and retail growth.</p>	<p>The policy basis for Alternative 3 is the same as for the No-action.</p> <p>Land use and development under this alternative would focus on modest growth and change in transportation functionality and neighborhood growth. Alternative 3 would result in increased office, retail, institutional, and residential growth, but at a lower scale and intensity than Alternative 1. Under this alternative the Eastgate/I-90 corridor would contain highway-related development with auto-orientated office complexes. This plan would encourage growth and re-investment in infrastructure utilizing the highway as its centerpiece. Due to the modest level of land use changes reflected in this alternative, land use incompatibilities are unlikely. Like Alternatives 1 and 2, Alternative 3 would require changes to the City’s Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Code, and Zoning Map.</p> <p>Projected growth under Alternative 3 includes 500,000 sq ft of office, 200,000 sq ft of retail, and 280,000 sq ft of institutional use. In addition, 400 new residential units and 100 new hotel rooms are projected. No growth in industrial use is projected. Alternative 3 reflects the greatest amount of retail growth of the three Action alternatives, but the least amount of office and hotel growth.</p>

Associated Impacts	No Action	Alternative 1 Jobs/Housing Mix	Alternative 2 Regional Employment Center	Alternative 3 Functional Improvements
<b>Housing</b>	<p>Housing surrounding the Eastgate/I-90 study area is comprised largely of existing single-family neighborhoods. Housing within the study area itself is very limited, and is confined to the area east of 139<sup>th</sup> Ave SE and west of Bellevue College.</p> <p>Under the No-action Alternative, existing neighborhoods are unlikely to be affected by zoning or construction of projected office, industrial, and institutional land use development.</p>	<p>Under Alternative 1, existing surrounding residential neighborhoods would not be affected by zoning changes. Housing in the city would not be adversely impacted. This Alternative could add up to 2000 new residential units in the study area.</p>	<p>Alternative 2 would not promote the development of new residential units in the study area, but it would also not adversely impacts housing in existing surrounding neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Alternative 3 could add up to 400 housing units in the study area. Potential impacts would be similar to Alternative 1 except that less residential development would be likely.</p>
<b>Aesthetics</b>	<p>Under the No-action Alternative, the aesthetic character of the study area would remain relatively static. The addition of the Mountains-To-Sound Greenway trail on the south side of the I-90 corridor and a new park built on the old Bellevue Airfield in the northeast study area would constitute the major landscape changes under this scenario. Additional office, industrial, and institutional development would likely replace older buildings providing new frontages and updating the architecture and character of the area.</p>	<p>Under Alternative 1, the transit hub at the Eastgate park-and-ride would become a gateway for the community. The aesthetic character would fit in with the Bellevue College and office complex character, while promoting parks, resting points, and landscaping that would accentuate human scale architectural features and multiple pathways that would make a lasting impression. Green design would be incorporated into new building and transportation construction.</p>	<p>Under this alternative, the character of the area would be that of a large, integrated campus. Notably, the 150<sup>th</sup> interchange would be landscaped to integrate with the campus-like character and serve as a focal point for a visual gateway for the surrounding area. New development would incorporate green design into project development and construction.</p>	<p>Under this alternative, the aesthetic character of the study area would not appreciably change. Land uses would continue to be predominantly highway-related development with auto oriented office complexes. Connections, landscaping, and streetscapes would be improved.</p> <p>Some aesthetic improvement would be expected to result from providing a gateway treatment to the 150<sup>th</sup> interchange that incorporates naturalistic landscaping and ecological functions, and the development of new housing that would contribute to the variety of architectural scale and treatments.</p>
<b>Light and Glare Impacts (will light and glare be produced)</b>	<p>Several buildings, walkways, and parking lots within the project area produce exterior lighting for safety during nighttime hours. No significant addition to nighttime lighting would result under the No-action Alternative.</p> <p>The greatest sources of glare during daylight hours would come from glass windows of buildings and auto dealers located along the I-90 corridor. Under the No-action Alternative, auto dealers are likely to expand operations and would contribute to increased glare during daylight hours.</p>	<p>Office, retail, institutional, and residential development proposed under Alternative 1 would result in increased nighttime lighting. Lighting for all development would comply with the city’s lighting standards.</p> <p>Sources of glare during daylight hours would come from glass windows associated with new or redeveloped buildings. If construction follows the City’s building code, impacts from glare are likely to be avoided or minimized. Overall impacts are not expected to be significant.</p>	<p>Alternative 2 could result in slightly greater overall development than Alternative 1, potential impacts from nighttime light and daytime glare could be slightly greater. But, all lighting and glare producing surfaces would comply with city standards and significant impacts are not anticipated.</p>	<p>Potential impacts would be similar to Alternative 1 except that less residential development would be likely.</p>
<b>Historical/Cultural Impacts (national, state, or local preservation sites)</b>	<p>There are no sites listed on the state or national registers. In the event that a historic, cultural or archaeological resource was unexpectedly exposed during excavation or grading, construction would be temporarily halted and the City and Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) would be notified. Construction would not resume until the City, WOAHP, and a professional archaeologist had</p> <p>Archeological and cultural resources would be examined on a project-by-project basis and would include a review of the National Register of Historic Places and the Washington Heritage Register.</p>	<p>Potential impacts would not differ from No-action, except that greater areas would be developed and thus there would be more opportunities for inadvertent discovery. Mitigation would be the same as for the No-action Alternative.</p>	<p>Potential would be similar to those described under Alternative 1. Slightly more development could incrementally increase the potential for inadvertent discovery.</p>	<p>Potential impacts would be similar to Alternative 1 except that less redevelopment would be likely.</p>

Associated Impacts	No Action	Alternative 1 Jobs/Housing Mix	Alternative 2 Regional Employment Center	Alternative 3 Functional Improvements		
Traffic Operations	Two trip generation models were used to estimate PM peak hour vehicle trip generation per square foot of development under each alternative. The BKR and MXD models estimate that the No Action Alternative would generate 1.35 and 1.32 trips per square foot of development, respectively.	Alternative 1 is estimated to generate 1.21 and 1.14 trips per square foot of development (BKR and MXD models, respectively). These represent a 10 or 13.4 percent reduction in trips compared to the No Action.	Alternative 2 is estimated to generate 1.35 and 1.27 trips per square foot of development (BKR and MXD models, respectively). These represent a 0.1 or 4.1 percent reduction in trips compared to the No Action.	Alternative 1 is estimated to generate 1.33 and 1.30 trips per square foot of development (BKR and MXD models, respectively). These represent a 1.1 or 1.7 percent reduction in trips compared to the No Action.		
	Peak hour volumes (vehicles per hour; both directions) at key study intersection were estimated for the No Action Alternative as follows:	Peak hour volumes (vehicles per hour; both directions) at key study intersection were estimated for Alternative 1 as follows:	Peak hour volumes (vehicles per hour; both directions) at key study intersection were estimated for Alternative 2 as follows:	Peak hour volumes (vehicles per hour; both directions) at key study intersection were estimated for Alternative 1 as follows:		
	<b>Intersection</b> 148 <sup>th</sup> Ave SE south of SE 28 <sup>th</sup> St: 128 <sup>th</sup> Ave SE/Factoria Blvd north of SE 36 <sup>th</sup> St: Factoria Blvd south of SE 36 <sup>th</sup> St: SE Eastgate Way east of 156 <sup>th</sup> Ave SE: SE Eastgate Way west of 150 <sup>th</sup> Ave SE: Richards Rd south of SE 32 <sup>nd</sup> St:	<b>Volume</b> 4,399 4,778 4,901 2,841 2,328 3,749	<b>Intersection</b> 148 <sup>th</sup> Ave SE south of SE 28 <sup>th</sup> St: 128 <sup>th</sup> Ave SE/Factoria Blvd north of SE 36 <sup>th</sup> St: Factoria Blvd south of SE 36 <sup>th</sup> St: SE Eastgate Way east of 156 <sup>th</sup> Ave SE: SE Eastgate Way west of 150 <sup>th</sup> Ave SE: Richards Rd south of SE 32 <sup>nd</sup> St:	<b>Volume</b> 4,444 4,893 5,022 2,992 2,144 3,988	<b>Intersection</b> 148 <sup>th</sup> Ave SE south of SE 28 <sup>th</sup> St: 128 <sup>th</sup> Ave SE/Factoria Blvd north of SE 36 <sup>th</sup> St: Factoria Blvd south of SE 36 <sup>th</sup> St: SE Eastgate Way east of 156 <sup>th</sup> Ave SE: SE Eastgate Way west of 150 <sup>th</sup> Ave SE: Richards Rd south of SE 32 <sup>nd</sup> St:	<b>Volume</b> 4,373 4,738 4,925 2,677 1,914 3,781
Public Services and Utilities (Fire, Police, parks, water/stormwater, sewer)	The project area is located in a previously developed district of the city of Bellevue. Public services and utilities including but not limited to fire, police, parks, water/stormwater, and sewer services have been incorporated into the existing infrastructure.	Alterative1 promotes increased office and residential development, which would increase the demand for public services. However, the existing service and utility infrastructure is adequate to serve the anticipated growth, and substantial upgrades are not expected to be needed. Therefore, significant impacts to public services are not anticipated.	While Alternative 2 could include more development than Alternative 1, it does not include residential development. Residential development is a greater driver of public service needs such as schools, fire and police. Impacts under this alternative would be less than under Alternative 1.	Potential impacts would be similar to Alternative 1 except that less redevelopment would be likely.		
	Under the No-Acton Alternative, utilities and services would not be substantially upgraded, with the notable exception of the development of the new park at the Bellevue Airfield.					